



Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas
Second District

Sheila Kuehl
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Medical Officer

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Deputy Director, Strategy and Operations

313 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 912
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: (213) 240-8101
Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

*To ensure access to high-quality,
patient-centered, cost-effective
health care to Los Angeles County
residents through direct services at
DHS facilities and through
collaboration with community and
university partners.*



www.dhs.lacounty.gov

May 25, 2017

Dear Prospective Proposer

**ADDENDUM NO. 1 TO REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF
QUALIFICATIONS FOR RADIATION THERAPY SERVICES**

As indicated in the Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ), Section 2.5, Vendors' Questions, the questions received in regard to the RFSQ have been compiled with the appropriate responses provided in Attachment I and is issued as Addendum No. 1 to the RFSQ.

The Addendum is posted on the DHS Contracts and Grants Website at <http://cg.dhs.lacounty.gov/>.

As a reminder, the Statements of Qualification (SOQ) submission deadline is **Monday, June 12, 2017, by 12:00 Noon, PST.**

Thank you for your interest in contracting with the County of Los Angeles.

Attachment (1)

MS:ms

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
REQUEST FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATION
FOR RADIATION THERAPY SERVICES
RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS**

Question 1: Instructions to Vendors, Section 2.7, Paragraph 2.7.2.B.2, page 25:

Paragraph 2.7.2.B.2 references the need to have board certified providers. The language that prompted the question is as follows: *"Vendor must ensure that Radiologists on staff have current licenses to practice medicine from the Medical Board in the State of California and are certified by the American Board of Radiology or American Board of Nuclear Medicine."*

If an existing physician is board eligible, but has not yet taken his/her boards, is this physician excluded from this contract or can he/she be added with the understanding board certification is in process?

Response 1: The requirements of the RFSQ state that Radiologists on staff must have current licenses to practice medicine from the Medical Board in the State of California and certification by the American Board of Radiology or American Board of Nuclear Medicine. A physician on staff who is Board eligible, but has not yet taken his/her boards, is not excluded from this contract and can be added with the understanding that Board certification is in process.

Question 2: If a physician is hired and has grandfathered status in to radiation oncology (i.e., does not require board certification), will that physician be able to participate in this contract?

Response 2: Yes.

Question 3: Will mid-level practitioners (Physician Assistant and Nurse Practitioner) be considered for participation?

Response 3: Yes, it is understood that the medical care furnished to County Referred Patients shall be provided by licensed Physicians, however it is not intended to limit the provision of patient care services by other practitioners such as Radiation Therapy Technologists and nursing personnel affiliated with, or employed by the Contractor, who can provide services within the scope of their professional licensure and certification.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
REQUEST FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATION
FOR RADIATION THERAPY SERVICES
RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS**

Question 4: Instructions to Vendors, Section 2.7, Paragraph 2.7.7, page 27:

Paragraph 2.7.7 references the need provide the company's financial statements; in order to determine which legal entity (or entities) would be included in this request, can the County describe what the requested financial statements will be used to evaluate?

Response 4: A Financial Capability Review is used to verify that a prospective Vendor is financially stable, has sufficient resources to provide the necessary performance requirements of any resultant Master Agreement and has sufficient funds to pay operating expenses. The review will include an analysis of a prospective Vendor's solvency, debt obligations, liquidity, historical profit and loss, cash flow, operating trends and financial commitments.

Question 5: In order to be compliant with Corporate policies, will the County sign a NDA with the Vendor prior to the RFSQ submission?

Response 5: For purposes of answering this question, the County assumes NDA means a Non-Disclosure Agreement. The County will not sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement with any Vendor prior to the RFSQ submission. Pursuant to RFSQ Section 1.12 - Notice to Vendor's Regarding the Public Records Act - all SOQs submitted in response to the RFSQ become a matter of public record, with the exception of those parts of each SOQ which are justifiably defined and identified by the Vendor as business or trade secrets. The Vendor must specifically label only those provisions of their respective SOQ which are "Trade Secrets", "Confidential", or "Proprietary" in nature; however the County shall not in any way, be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such record or any parts thereof, if disclosure is required or permitted under the California Public Records Act or otherwise by law (RFSQ Sub-Paragraph 1.12.1).

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
REQUEST FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATION
FOR RADIATION THERAPY SERVICES
RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS**

Question 6: Master Agreement Provisions, Section 8.28, Paragraph 8.28.1, first bullet, page 33 and Paragraph 2.28.2, page 34:

Paragraph 2.28.1 references the need to add the County as an Additional Insured. The language that prompted the question is as follows: *"Certificate(s) of insurance coverage (Certificate) satisfactory to County, and a copy of an Additional Insured endorsement confirming County and its Agents (defined below) have been given Insured status under the Contractor's General Liability policy..."*.

Paragraph 2.28.2 identifies the Contractor's General Liability policy as the policy that requires the County be listed as an Additional Insured. The language that has prompted the question is as follows: *"The County of Los Angeles, its Special Districts, Elected Officials, Officers, Agents, Employees and Volunteers (collectively County and its Agents) shall be provided additional insured status under Contractor's General Liability policy with respect to liability arising out of Contractor's ongoing and completed operations performed on behalf of the County. County and its Agents additional insured status shall apply with respect to liability and defense of suites[sic] arising out of the Contractor's acts or omissions, whether such liability is attributable to the Contractor or the County. The full policy limits and scope of protection also shall apply to the County and its Agents as an additional insured, even if they exceed the County's minimum Required Insurance specifications herein. Use of an automatic additional insured endorsement form is acceptable providing it satisfies the Required Insurance Provisions herein."*

Can a Contractor list the County as a Certificate Holder instead of an Additional Insured?

Response 6: No, the County and its Agents shall be provided additional insured status under the Contractor's General Liability policy.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
REQUEST FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATION
FOR RADIATION THERAPY SERVICES
RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS**

Question 7: If our corporate policy prevents us from adding additional insureds to any of our policies, is this a deal breaker for the County?

Response 7: Yes

Question 8: **Master Agreement Provisions, Section 8.29, Paragraph 8.29.1, page 37:**

Paragraph 8.29.1 again references the need to add the County and its Agents as an additional insured. The language that prompted this question is as follows: *“Commercial General Liability insurance (Providing scope of coverage equivalent to ISO policy from CG 00 01), naming County and its Agents as an additional insured with limits of not less than...”* with the rest of the language noting limits.

Our question is no other Paragraph in this Section (Paragraphs 8.29.2 - 8.29.5) seem to require the County or its Agents be added as an additional insured. Is our interpretation correct that no other insurance policies (Workers Comp, Automobile and Professional Liability) require the County or its Agents be added as an additional insured?

Response 8: Section 8.28.2 - Additional Insured Status and Scope of Coverage, of the Master Agreement, requires that the County of Los Angeles, its Special Districts, Elected Officials, Officers, Agents, Employees and Volunteers (collectively County and its Agents) shall be provided additional insured status under Contractor's General Liability policy with respect to liability arising out of Contractor's ongoing and completed operations performed on behalf of the County, however it is not a requirement for Workers Compensation and Employers' Liability; Automobile Liability or Professional Liability/Errors and Omissions.